LIBRARY
ELIZABETH McCORMICK MEMORIAL FUND
848 North Dearborn Street
Chicago
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
University of Illinois
Navy Pier, CHICAGO

The COMPASS

AMERICAN·ASSOCIATION·OF·SOCIAL·WORKERS
130 E. 22d St. · New York City

MARCH, 1934 VOLUME XV, NUMBER 6

THE CONFERENCE ON GOVERNMENTAL OBJECTIVES FOR SOCIAL WORK

Prepared by the special reporter for THE COMPASS

A ROOM with long green covered tables, chairs down either side, red folders full of material for discussion, about 200 representative social workers from 44 chapters of the A.A.S.W., formed the setting for a professional experiment, the Conference on Governmental Objectives for Social Work.

Evaluation of the conference would be difficult but might be attempted on the basis of the purposes as presented by the President, Stanley P. Davies, in opening the first session. He first pointed out that "the largest tasks lying immediately ahead in social work are those which must fall largely to governmental agencies, federal, state, and local"; that while emergency programs must be made adequate, a more permanent program, growing out of the agencies and functions of the emergency, would have to be evolved, and that an important next step was to find out what the social workers of the country agreed on so that they could help in shaping policies, rather than merely registering views upon issues which had already arisen. It might be well to keep this purpose of the conference in mind when reading the recommendations voted at the last session. As complete interpretations of the professional evidence they are deficient. As a list of all the subjects on which social workers have experience, it is quite incomplete. The document does not reveal the differences of opinion, sharp at times, which were registered. You will perhaps think up some other faults when you read it. But keep in mind, if you please, that it is a list of recommendations on which a group of social workers, drawn together from almost all parts of the country, as representatives of 44 chapters found themselves in substantial agreement, and that they have set up for themselves and their colleagues, that much of a program to go to work on.

The second purpose of the conference, according to President Davies, was to broaden the basis for making up the program of the Association with reference to governmental action. He pointed out that action on federal relief bills and hearings had been taken by the officers, with little opportunity to consult chapters or members. Under pressure, action was necessary and worked successfully. But he pointed out that needs are not always so apparent and that a more comprehensive program for relating social work to government would have to be based on some plan by which the experience of social workers could be pooled and made effective.

What an observer saw and heard was fairly convincing that the conference was successful from this point of view. Over a period of two months, the subjects for discussion had been sent to the chapters, followed by documents from committees, and those had been used as a basis of chapter meetings, discussions, and fact gathering by committees. Through these preliminary steps the delegates came to the conference with the heightened status of interpreters voicing local group discussion and group decision. The number "present" was not just 200, but several thousand who had participated in the preliminary meetings.

Neither did the conference end when it adjourned. This was a conference in which the delegates apparently stayed through all the sessions, and when it was over, one had the definite impression that many of the Association's chapters were going to go to work within a few days on plans for revising the poor laws, on taxation, and social security programs.

Current Relief Problems

The report which formed the basis of the first morning's discussion was concerned with civil

works, with home relief, with adequacy of relief, relief to transients, and general problems of administration. About 15 questions were selected for discussion, but the fears of the chairman, Arthur Dunham, as to time were justified. In spite of excellent leadership the only question which got full consideration was civil works which was pushed into the foreground by the demobilization policy. What was going to happen to the people who were being demobilized? What should be substituted in the way of income?

Miss Colcord suggested as a point of departure the formulation of her committee:

> The value of the civil works idea is lost if people have to be selected for it on the basis of need or if it fails to provide jobs for the majority of employables out of work. It should be considered as a plan to increase consuming power and to provide a new type of unemployment insurance and not as a relief measure. It should be continued and increased but not to cover the entire mass of the unemployed since unemployables should be provided for otherwise and since secondary employment will be stimulated which could be counted upon to pick up at least a third of the load.

The tendency of the discussion was to stress the relationship of civil works to the total program for employment and relief—its integration with public works on the one hand and with relief (including work relief) on the other. With recognition that in both the public works and civil works programs jobs were assigned on the basis of efficiency, there was considerable feeling that there should still be opportunities for useful work by the handicapped or those less well qualified on the basis of efficiency. How these various services could be integrated was not considered in detail. The consensus on this particular question which is embodied in the recommendations carries with it a good deal more than attention to the immediate problem. Immediate steps should lead toward an integrated and varied program to provide security for people who are out of work, not just for this year and next but for the future.

The recommendation on civil works did not by any means cover the range of discussion, which included emphases involving responsibility upon social workers for more precision in studying and in thinking, the whole problem of financing the projects, problems of administration, wage rates, the tremendous need for flexibility in administration, and imagination in the development of a variety of projects. How can we keep efficiency for the job as the main test for employment without losing sight of the fact that need must also be met? More thought, more study, more experimentation and evaluation by social workers themselves were implicit in the conclusions.

Federal Emergency Relief Administration

In the afternoon Harry Hopkins talked with us about the activities of FERA in relation to civil works, relief and personnel. He gave his time generously permitting opportunity for questions. He was rather intimate in his account of himself as a social worker in Washington, coming to value the politician highly in contrast to many of the lobbyists, learning the importance of appointing individuals who are fundamentally in sympathy with the objectives of the administration and growing in conviction as to the greatness of "the man in the White House." He was emphatic and whole-hearted concerning socially useful programs of country-wide importance and permanent value which the remaining CWA and CWS will carry on, such as adult education, nursery schools, a reorganized kindergarten system and municipal orchestras.

A planned economy for the country as a whole, not temporary relief measures, was advocated by Mr. Hopkins in the following statement:

> I do not look upon my designation as the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator as such to be part of this long range plan. It is an emergency, temporary job, and that should be divorced entirely from the question of what is to be the long range plan of economy in America because as sure as we are sitting in this room there are profound changes going on and more are ahead of us and the new economy in my mind is being developed. How or where that is going I do not know but its objective must be the assurance of a decent standard of living for every person in America, some kind of guaranteed employment to able bodied men, new utilization of the land and a completely new picture in economic life as to the rewards which shall come to the workers and distribution of wealth on a decent basis in America.

However, on the immediate issue as to how the people demobilized from civil works would be cared for, the administration, through Mr. Hopkins, in no way took the social workers into confidence. Mr. Hopkins' spontaneous statements and his replies to questions asserted that definite plans were under discussion but could not be divulged and urged that confidence in the administration as a result of its past demonstration be fostered. At the same time he made it apparent that federal measures and plans have been and would be based on articulated needs and consequent pressure. Several times he spoke of not sensing this or that need or of not having felt pressure for this or that.

The conference accordingly continued in its effort to clarify, without the guide of any framework, social work experience and the possible shape that effective plans might take.

Housing

The remainder of the afternoon session was devoted to a discussion of housing. Mr. Eugene Klaber, Chief of the Technical Staff, Division of Housing, Public Works Administration and Mr. Robert Kohn, Director of the Division of Housing, opened the discussion by outlining briefly some of the philosophy and some of the immediate next steps which should be in the minds of social workers in connection with this particular problem. Here, again, it was difficult to separate the immediate from the long time planning. Actually as we follow the statements of the leaders and the later discussion we are keenly aware that immediate steps must fit into some adequate long term plan.

Several of the speakers brought out the fact that housing plans should be thought of not as isolated projects but integrated into the total community's planning for the productive living of its citizens. City planning commissions, it was suggested, have confined their attention too frequently to traffic problems and should broaden their scope to include total community planning. There was also recognition that housing problems are not confined to large cities and that up to the present time very little has been done in the smaller cities and in the rural communities where conditions are frequently deplorable.

There would seem to be no question from the response at the conference and from the recommendations that social workers have a vital interest as well as responsibility in housing plans and projects, but there is more uncertainty as to how to go ahead in this field than in any other which was up for discussion. This is probably not to be wondered at since it is shared by housing experts themselves but it does suggest some definite discussion in local chapters so that at least the reality of local housing problems may be envisaged far more clearly than at present. The discussion of the group showed conviction but lacked the knowledge of subject matter essential to successful enterprise.

THE COMPASS

Published monthly except August by

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

130 EAST 22ND STREET NEW YORK, N. Y.

Officers

Stanley P. Davies, *Pres.* Dorothy E. Wyeor, *3rd V-Pres.*
Katharine Lenroot, *1st V-Pres.* Elizabeth H. Dexter, *Sec.*
Porter R. Lee, *2nd V-Pres.* Leroy A. Ramsdell, *Treas.*

Walter West ——— *Executive Secretary*
Florence Taylor ——— *Assistant Executive Secretary*
Christine C. Robb ——— *Assistant Executive Secretary*

Entered as second-class matter at the post office in New York, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912

Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1924.

Subscription: Non-Members $1.00 per annum. Members including membership fee $3.00 and over.

United States Employment Service

The growth of the U. S. Employment Service during the last six months is one of the most startling developments of the recovery program of the Administration. On July 1, 1933, Frank Persons became head of the service. At that time there were 135 free public employment offices in the whole United States. Twenty-four states had no state office. At the present time there are in the United States about 3,500 employment offices organized either on regular employment basis or under the provisions of the Re-Employment Act. The aim of the service has been to have an employment office in every county but in some instances a smaller unit has been used. The primary principle of the Wagner Act under which the service has been organized was, and still is, that the United States Employment Service shall not be a group of federal offices operating in the states under federal control but shall be ultimately and fundamentally a confederation of the state employment services with federal aid to those services and with federal supervision of the standards of such services.

Mr. Persons pointed out the successful efforts which had been made to arouse and maintain local interest in the development of the employment bureaus, with the result that these bureaus are now reaching beyond the large population centers into all parts of the state.

The seriousness of curtailing this comprehensive employment service at the present time was stressed by Mr. Persons, for not only do we need employment bureaus in order to make effective our current services for meeting the unemployment situation but if, as we hope, unemployment insurance is to be a part of our planned economy, the establishment and maintenance of adequate employment bureaus will be absolutely necessary for its adequate administration.

The conviction of the group that an integrated employment service is of paramount importance in the reemployment program was expressed in the resolution urging the restoration of the original appropriation. There was agreement also that such a service is essential not only for the purposes which Mr. Persons outlined but as a method of knowing constantly the fluctuation in the degree of unemployment and offers some basis for intelligent social planning. The task for social workers in their local chapters would seem here again to be a matter of developing public opinion and interpreting not only the

need but the effectiveness of the services in such a way that support will be forthcoming.

Revision of State Poor Laws

The next session was focused primarily on the future. What shall we as social workers do at this critical moment to take advantage of the impetus of emergency relief programs so that we may develop an adequate nation-wide system of public welfare? This is no mere matter of revision of poor laws. In scope and magnitude it reaches back into problems which were discussed at the previous sessions of the conference and forward into the daily jobs of every social worker.

Edith Abbott's presentation of her Committee's material, supplemented by verbal statements from various members of her Committee, was followed by a general statement from Harry Lurie on sources of support for the welfare program which had been outlined. Both Miss Abbott and Mr. Lurie presented principles and goals toward which social workers should be moving. Fundamental to both their hypotheses was a recognition of national responsibility both in financial and planning areas for the welfare program of the nation. As Miss Breckinridge phrased it: "The sources of support should be as wide as the sources of misery;" or to quote Mr. Swift, Chairman of the Association's Committee on Federal Action: "Government is the only effective instrument of society for the social use of our national wealth."

Miss Abbott in opening the discussion emphasized the need for changes in terminology, changes in form, changes in poor law principles, and changes in administration. The effect at the present time of the outworn terminology upon the social thinking of communities was recognized as decidedly anti-social. Undoubtedly it colors the kind of care given to those in need of relief and to a certain extent influences the municipalities or other authorities in their choice of personnel.

It was suggested that the first step in the development of an adequate program would be an enabling federal act which signified the interest of the federal government in public welfare the country over and provided for grants-in-aid to states which develop adequate state and local programs. Contributions from the federal and state governments would insure better administration and would carry with them some general supervisory relationships. The whole structure of government is involved in this kind of social planning; public welfare must be integrated with other activities which are supported at government expense and brought into line with modern conditions of living.

In opening up the question of the adequacy of the resources of the nation to carry out any such program of public welfare as the group seemed agreed upon, Mr. Lurie expressed his conviction that we do have in this country sufficient economic resources to provide for the well being of our population. The resources are here—the question is, how are they to be directed to the support of social needs? This immediately assumes on the part of social workers a responsibility in connection with taxation plans. While we may recognize that we are not experts in this field we must face squarely the fact that the services we advocate must be paid for and we shall be in a stronger position if we are able to outline the ways in which the expenses we feel essential may be met. One suggestion was that social workers have joint group discussions with those who are expert in the field of taxation. Meantime as citizens and as social workers, the group felt prepared to take a stand for the kind of taxation which means distribution of wealth as over against taxation which falls too heavily on the lower income groups.

Throughout the session, the discussion of goals and principles presented was so significant that if space permitted we should give it in full. In general there was acceptance of the principles—if failure to disagree may be interpreted as agreement. There was acceptance of the assumption that the time to act is now if we are to capitalize on interest created by recent relief activities. There was implicit and expressed conviction that social workers have an undisputed obligation for leadership in planning for public welfare—that they should be not a pressure group, not a critic group, but should assume an active role. The differences of opinion arose when the discussion touched on the steps to be taken to make effective the principles which had been accepted. Some members undoubtedly felt that several small steps might be better than one long stride, as, for example in the abolishment of settlement laws.

The agreement as represented in the several recommendations was achieved through a full recognition that probably a variety of processes must be used in achieving the objectives outlined. Time was too short and the group too large to allow for much development of minority opinions. The task of bringing out the partially revealed differences, of frankly facing them and trying to harmonize and integrate them into effective action is the immediate task waiting the attention of the chapters.

Unemployment Insurance

Should social workers be more active than they have been in the past in advocating state and national provisions for unemployment insurance? In spite of the fact that the Wagner-Lewis Bill is now pending, the general feeling among the group that no provision for unemployment insurance would meet such a problem as we have had for the last three or four years evidently had its effect on the discussion.

Father Haas urged the group to think in terms of the part unemployment insurance might play in long time social planning. He deplored the fact that in connection with such legislation as that establishing old-age pensions some groups of social workers had opposed the movement and he urged social workers to establish themselves on the inside in any movement for social legislation which they felt was desirable. Planning, making policies and applying them to unemployment insurance would of course involve an understanding of desirable legislation, a knowledge of what was attainable as well as what was desirable and a setting of definite standards for the security of the unemployed and therefore of society.

Discussion, which was limited to a few members, included the following questions: Is a nation-wide plan for unemployment insurance preferable to any attempt to get action by states? What should be the minimum and maximum payments? Should we stand for something more ample than the $7.00 a week, ten weeks minimum which is provided in the Wagner-Lewis Bill, or should we endorse the Lundeen Bill which provides for compensation to unemployed workers in amounts equal to average local wages? Action was taken endorsing the Wagner-Lewis Bill with the definite recommendation that the period of payment and the amount be increased but from both the content of the discussion and the limited participation we would deduce that many of us need to begin at the beginning on this whole subject.

Personnel

In the discussion of personnel, the conference faced some immediate and practical questions. Public service which calls for social workers has increased rapidly during the last four years. There are probably no available figures which would indicate the number of positions in emergency relief set-ups and public welfare departments which should be filled with qualified social workers. We know that the number is large and we know, moreover, that even in the positions for which we have some figures, the supply of social workers who qualify by training and experience is too small to go around. Along with this, as Mr. Pray pointed out in his introductory remarks, we recognize all too well that the quality of public welfare service—and for the moment this means the emergency relief work also—depends on the quality of its personnel. Mr. Pray suggested as basic to any discussion of personnel in a long time government program for social welfare the assumption that public service calls for workers of the highest qualifications.

What standards should we specify? Mr. Pray proposed that (1) the minimum should be no less than that now required for junior membership in the A.A.S.W.; (2) positions involving supervision and direction should be filled by persons who meet the requirements for full membership in the A.A.S.W.; (3) public agencies should offer adequate, sound leadership and training experience within the organization as well as opportunity for further professional education opportunities outside the organization; (4) there should be some system, preferably probationary employment, which would make it possible to sift out employees who do not qualify from a personality standpoint whatever their training may have been; (5) the merit system should be accepted as fundamental to the establishment and maintenance of sound professional social work in public service.

If public service does secure adequate workers how is it to keep them? The whole question of professional social work on a professional level in public service involves not only matters of compensation and of preparation but of working conditions. In his preliminary remarks, Mr. Pray further stressed the need for flexibility and the recognition that as in our previous discussions we are thinking in terms of goals rather than of immediate achievement. He suggested that a committee of the A.A.S.W. should be actively at work studying the subject so as to take advantage of every opportunity to present the importance of sound personnel standards wherever social work is practiced in public service.

We wonder whether every member of the group there present accepted without question the first four points which Mr. Pray outlined. Certainly they do express minima although at the moment they seem to be at the far end of the telescope. There was practically no discussion of them and no discussion as to how the goals he had outlined might be reached. There was considerable discussion of the principle of civil service—how it works, its advantages and disadvantages, and so on. Perhaps the discussion focussed so largely on civil service because this is a concrete objective. The fact that members

of the public service themselves spoke from the point of view both of the appointer and the appointee gave a vivid reality to much of the discussion of civil service. Most of them brought out the protection of civil service to the job and to the worker although there was due recognition of the fact that it is by no means perfect.

The subject of personnel opens up for social workers a field for immediate action. Is it possible for us to interpret the sense of the conference as favoring not only active promotion of certain minimum standards but more responsibility than we have yet undertaken for building up this qualified personnel? Does this include professional school activity, activity of local chapters as well as activity of public service groups? Does it perhaps include not only the orientation of unqualified workers so that they may do an interim job of fair adequacy, but also the orientation of professionally qualified workers to the special demands of the public service job?

Recommendations

It was a weary but determined group of at least 100 delegates which got together at the last session to consider the recommendations of its special committee. Jane Hoey gave a decided lift to their spirits by a message from President Roosevelt whom she had seen that afternoon. She had talked with him about the discussion of the conference and he had said that he wished he might have been with us. "After all," he went on, "social workers and I have the same objective in common—social justice for everyone."

With this encouragement, the group plunged into a lively discussion of the report of the Committee of which Dorothy Kahn was Chairman, with the result that the recommendations as printed reflect points which were debated in this last meeting as well as in the other sessions. The Committee had in mind not so much a series of resolutions as an attempt to crystallize and point up the trends disclosed in the conference discussion. The recommendations in their opinion should be thought of not as conclusions or finalities but rather as the first steps in the development of a program of public welfare.

What Next?

The question of what next, is of paramount importance. Again and again the conference, as individuals during the discussions, as a group in its recommendations, demanded that social workers should assume leadership not only in long time planning for public welfare but in making that planning effective. Leadership, as we interpret this thinking, is the more or less inevitable consequence of conviction based on knowledge. The conference may have determined some of the broad areas where social work leadership should function both immediately and in the future. It left to the individual members, to the chapters, to the Association, the intricate and difficult problems of developing and making effective the leadership required by its recommendations, now and in the future.

GERTRUDE SPRINGER TAKES THE CONFERENCE PULSE

(From the March Mid-monthly *Survey*)

Sampling their own blood-stream, finding it full of good red corpuscles and fighting phagocytes, social workers have discovered themselves as a coherent body with something to say and the will to say it out loud. . . .

Delegates came to Washington instructed by their constituencies to give battle for the views they represented. And battle they did under the amiable gavel of Stanley P. Davies, president of the Association, through five long sessions of uninhibited discussion, lightened occasionally by the give and take of the "genial raspberry." . . .

There were no two opinions about the hoary old poor-laws . . . abolish was the only word for them. Edith Abbott of Chicago, leading the discussion, pointed out that state responsibility remains a trend rather than a reality, citing Illinois with its fifteen hundred responsible taxing and administrating poor authorities, and Ohio with its 1,353 administrative units and six thousand officials responsible for poor relief. . . .

The discussion of the financial basis for a governmental security program, led by Harry L. Lurie of New York, generated—and let off—a good deal of steam. Apparently everyone knew what such a program should hold and so could buckle down to the business of paying for it. . . . It mattered not at all to this articulate gathering that, as someone ventured to point out, it had no authoritative status when it came to matters of redistributing wealth, and that in its zeal to get funds for welfare services it must be cautious of methods which might create more social problems than social values. But one need not be expert or authoritative, the discussion implied, to know that incomes, inheritances and excess profits

had scarcely been scratched, and that sales' taxes and heavier burdens on homes and farms were not to be endured. . . .

The conference was as representative a gathering of social workers as the profession can muster. From every section of the country came leaders of long standing and youngsters feeling their first professional oats. That it was homogenous was due to a common experience with the most helpless victims of economic breakdown and a common will to protest the fruits of a system built on insecurity. If this observer is any judge of the temper of a meeting, the crackle of this one will carry back to the chapter organizations and envigor the rank and file of social workers everywhere.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

GENERAL

I. The Conference in addressing itself to the problems of governmental objectives for social work wishes to pay tribute to Congress and to the federal administration for recognizing its obligation to meet the needs of people in this emergency on a national basis, for thus developing for the first time a national system of aid to families and individuals, for special recognition of federal responsibility for service to transients and for bringing unemployment relief up to a more nearly adequate level.

In carrying out this program, we believe the best traditions and experience of social work have been utilized.

The Conference more especially pays tribute to the courageous and ingenious social thinking represented by such programs as the NRA, the NRS, FERA, the CCC and the CWA.

II. (a) *Recommended* that the Conference on Governmental Objectives for Social Work go on record as favoring the continuance of a large federal employment project based on qualifications for employment and *not* on need.

(b) *Recommended* that the Conference go on record as opposed to the present program for gradual demobilization and ultimate termination of the civil works program on May 1, 1934 until there is something better to take its place, because:

1. The facts show that there continues to be a large labor surplus resulting in a wide spread between the number of people wanting jobs and the number of jobs available.
2. The halting of the civil works program has already developed a serious feeling of insecurity among those on civil works.
3. This feeling of insecurity will increase so long as the discontinuance of civil works goes forward and no new plans have been announced.

III. This emergency has made us keenly aware of the fact that the sources of aid must be as wide as the sources of misery and that government is accordingly the only effective instrument for the social use of national wealth. Therefore, we believe that this is the time for the creation of a permanent, comprehensive, well-coordinated and adequate system of welfare services, so conceived as to insure ourselves, as a people, against the common hazards of our economic and social life, such as are inherent in unemployment, old age, widowhood, sickness or other factors which interfere with the normal processes of self-maintenance.

Essential correlaries to this proposition seem to be:

1. Financial and administrative participation on an equitable basis of federal, state, and local governments.
2. Substitution of modern welfare laws for the old poor laws so as to conform to these general concepts and to provide administrative units appropriate to the services included.
3. Abolition of settlement laws.
4. Personnel properly equipped to administer these services. It is the sense of the Conference that such personnel may best be secured by setting as our goal qualifications conforming to the professional standards set by this Association and utilization of the merit system for the selection of such personnel.

IV. We recognize our responsibility as social workers not only to advocate a national program of public welfare but likewise to point out definite methods by which such objectives can be achieved. We recognize that our social problems arise, not out of inherent limitations in either the wealth or the productive capacity of the nation, but rather out of our faulty distribution of wealth. Specifically, we suggest such possible changes in taxation methods as would stop the gaps in the present income tax law, recover the vast sums lost to government through the provision for deducting capital losses from current income, exempting various types of securities from taxation

and the exemption of employees in the public service.

We further urge increases of income taxes, progressive increases in the higher brackets, and increases in the excess profits and inheritance taxes. We further recommend a consideration of the social principles involved in taxation on real property.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Federal Relief Budget

The amount required for the federal relief budget for 1934-35 must depend on several unpredictable factors:

1. The extent of success of the recovery program.
2. The transfer to public work of numbers of the employable unemployed.
3. The number of families in the residual load.
4. The degree to which the present inadequate relief grants are liberalized.

It is recommended, in view of the probability that millions will continue to be unemployed during this period, that we shall not underestimate the size of load, and that appropriations shall be made with a view to carrying into effect, during this period, the other recommendation of this report regarding adequacy.

II. Standards and Methods of Relief

1. *Cash Relief*

(1) *Recommended* that the Conference go on record as favoring the substitution immediately, and in the long time program, of cash relief for relief in kind, in an amount adequate to include at least provision for: Food, fuel, light, shelter, health, clothing, household supplies.

(This recommendation assumes provision for necessary services to families who need guidance on health and other problems and protection from undue pressure for payment of back debts, etc.)

(2) *Recommended* that the Conference urge FERA to require as a general policy that states substitute cash relief in handling federal funds in an amount to cover needs specified above and that it use pressure on state relief administrations and legislatures and conduct active campaigns for the adoption of cash relief on the ground that it is economically possible and of far greater social value than relief in kind.

(3) *Recommended* that the Conference register its opinion that methods of utilizing surplus products should be developed other than distribution to families on relief. It believes that this distribution has manifested serious social and administrative disadvantages and is an anomaly in an adequate cash relief program.

2. *Care of Homeless*

(1) *Recommended* that the Conference go on record endorsing the admirable transient program which has been built up by FERA and suggesting that the following developments be given immediate consideration:

a. Provision of federal funds for hospitalization of transients.

b. Reduction of congregate care by providing work through the Transient Bureaus or the CCC or CWA, in order to give transients wages with which they could provide their own food and shelter.

c. Eligibility to workmen's compensation by which they should be protected as well as men on CCC and CWA, and to which they would be entitled if they were put on a wage basis.

d. Integrated program of care for local homeless and transients as means of improving standards of care for both groups, including special efforts to stabilize transient families.

3. *General Administrative Procedure*

(1) *Recommended* by the Conference that the administrative staff of FERA be increased to permit more intensive work and more constructive planning.

(2) *Recommended* by the Conference that the excellent work done by FERA to bring skilled and experienced personnel into state relief organizations be further extended by bringing more pressure to bear on state organizations to subordinate the residence requirement for state and local relief workers, in order to secure the most competent personnel available.

(3) *Recommended* by the Conference that FERA develop channels of intercommunication between state relief administrations by means of regional and national conferences, news bulletins, etc.

III. Standard of Living

Specific recommendations on this are considered by the Committee on Recommendations to be impossible at this time because

although constant reference is made to the need for a better standard of living, no standard has been agreed upon. The Committee would like to suggest, however, that members of the A.A.S.W. continue to point out, at every opportunity, that there is a difference between minimum subsistence and an adequate standard of living and that this has significance both in the emergency and for long-time planning.

IV. Rates of Pay on Federal Employment

Recommended that the Conference go on record as favoring the conservation of the principle of fair wage rates established for the Public Works Program. (A minority opinion differs from this point of view on the ground that in an emergency need for work and available relief funds must be reconciled.)

V. Federal Employment Service

The further development of the Federal Employment Service and related state programs is basic to all reemployment programs, both temporary and permanent.

Recommended that the Conference urge the Senate to restore the original appropriation of $3,700,000 which was cut in the House to $1,590,000, and that the chapters and members of the A.A.S.W take similar action immediately.

VI. Unemployment Insurance

Recommended that the Conference endorse Wagner-Lewis bill to promote the establishment of state systems of unemployment insurance, but *recommended* also that minimum benefits and period of payment specified in the bill be increased.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

VII. Child Labor Amendment

The permanent elimination of child labor is important in any program for maximum employment opportunities for adults as well as in any program for conservation and development of youth.

Recommended that the Conference go on record as favoring the adoption of the Child Labor Amendment and that the chapters support the amendment in the states where it has not yet been ratified.

VIII. (Section on Health referred to Committee on Federal Action.)

IX. Housing

1. The Conference wishes to go on record as believing that housing is socially the most useful element in a public works program.
2. In view of this belief, social workers have a responsibility to inform themselves on housing needs and proposed housing programs as well as their costs in their local communities, and to contribute from their experience and knowledge not only to the development of housing programs designed to meet the needs of the group requiring low cost housing, but also to the management of these programs.
3. Social workers have a responsibility to participate vigorously in interpretation of the essential elements in suggested housing programs such as (a) the operation of existing condemnation and sanitary laws; (b) relationship between private enterprise and housing programs; (c) lowered interest rates; (d) the relationship between housing programs and continuity in the building trades; (e) and the operation of city planning committees.

   Social workers also have a responsibility to evoke public sentiment for the promotion of a sound housing program.

X. Merit System

Recommended that the whole concept of the merit system as applied to the professional group be referred to the A.A.S.W. for comprehensive study and formulation. Meanwhile, pending changes in the laws, the principles embodied in the merit system should be utilized by appointing officers.

OTHER PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of proposals and recommendations were submitted at the conference which there was no opportunity to discuss during the meetings. Two of them are briefly summarized here.

1. Draft of a Program on Federal Action

This program, presented by Jacob Fisher of New York, was similar in some of its basic principles to the recommendations made by the conference but emphasized the importance of using the expert knowledge of the social worker to reinforce labor's effort to achieve a higher standard of living. Proposals calling for redistribution of wealth to provide economic and social security for all the people of this country, this program points out, must depend for effective

support on those who will benefit from the change, and not on those who benefit from the status quo. Social workers interested in raising the standard of living, therefore, can be most effective by supporting the program of the groups which suffer most from insecurity.

Specific proposals for raising the standard of living and maintaining it at a satisfactory level include support of the Lundeen Bill (see Bulletin V, Current Unemployment Insurance Proposals) a housing program which would benefit rural as well as urban areas, development of free hospital and clinic facilities, development of recreational and educational facilities, free federal employment exchanges, and vocational training programs for the young and the technologically displaced.

2. Health and Medical Care

Discussion of limitations in the present relief program brought out considerable testimony as to the increasing need of funds for medical care and for a constructive health program. Under the present regulations of FERA, funds are provided only for emergency care in the home and the privately supported hospitals and clinics have been obliged to care for a rapidly increasing number of free patients out of funds which are now so much diminished that they are faced with the necessity of refusing care to those most in need of professional services.

A recommendation urging FERA to modify its rulings to permit payment of hospital and clinical services on a fee basis was lost by a close vote and the question was referred to the Committee on Federal Action for more careful formulation and action.

CONFERENCE DISCUSSION BULLETINS

Discussion at the Conference on Governmental Objectives was based on six bulletins sent to the delegates before meetings. These bulletins are reproduced in order that this *Compass* may present the discussion material and more particularly because the continuing program of the Association and of the chapters will undoubtedly include further study and discussion on these subjects.

Titles of the six bulletins are: I. Current Relief Problems; II. Current Relief Statistics; III. Revision of State Poor Laws; IV. Future Coordination of Federal Relief Programs; V. Current Unemployment Insurance Proposals; VI. Current Housing Information.

I. CURRENT RELIEF PROBLEMS

(This memorandum was based on discussions of a sub-committee of the A. A. S. W. Committee on Federal Action of which Joanna C. Colcord is chairman. Current statistics on the subjects dealt with in this report are given in the second bulletin, Current Relief Statistics.)

A. General Considerations

Numbers on Relief

Data are not yet available to show whether the transfer of over three millions from relief to civil works has meant a concurrent reduction in the number on home relief. Reports from several cities would indicate that it has not and that relief plus civil works is now caring for a much greater number than relief alone was carrying in November.

In the beginning of a depression, the number of unemployed and the number of those in need of relief are far from synonymous. As the depression prolongs itself and resources become exhausted, the two figures tend to approach each other. But a glance at the two tables in the next memorandum on Current Relief Statistics will show that not even during October, 1933, were families on relief more than 30 per cent of the number of persons estimated as unemployed. Even allowing for the fact that not all unemployed persons have dependents and that many families on relief have more than one potential wage-earner idle, it is evident that up to the beginning of the civil works program, the major portion of those out of regular employment were still navigating without the aid of public relief.

Extent of Unemployment

There are only estimated figures as to the amount of unemployment at any period in this country. In relation to relief needs, we do not know what the number of different families represented may be, since more than one member is frequently registered. No means exist of knowing what proportion of these families are actually receiving relief or are in real need of it. All that we can say is, that although upwards of four million people are now on civil works, and in spite of the increases in employment due to the

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
University of Illinois
Navy Pier, CHICAGO

NRA, there are probably at least five or six millions, or upwards of nine millions in all, still out of regular employment.

Probable Duration of Unemployment

Social workers are reluctant to make statements which would run counter to the optimistic hopes of the country or be taken as criticism of the recovery program of the Administration for which the great majority of them feel the utmost respect and admiration. They realize that it is not necessary for Government to plan to reemploy on its own payroll all the present jobless and that somewhere in the upward trend of employment a point would be reached at which the pick-up in other trades, due to the need for tools and materials and to the increased purchasing power of those at work, could be counted on to reemploy the remaining employables. We find it impossible, however, to credit that such a situation can result by May 1, 1934, beyond which point it is understood that no plans exist to extend civil works.

But if the combined recovery in industry and agriculture, supplemented by public works, should suffice to make available as many jobs as civil works is now furnishing and even employ in addition some portion of the idle millions, is it conceivable that with selection of workers on the basis of efficiency there will not remain a vast army of the rejects of industry — the so-called unemployables?

We recall that there were few unemployables in 1918—the country could then make use of any hands that were willing to work. Unemployability is a relative term. When employers can draw a line freely, because of excess labor, they will draw it well above the normal in the working population and rank all below that abnormal standard of efficiency as "unemployable." It is this very tendency which short-day short-week plans seek to curb. If the program is successful —if industry after absorbing all the super-talent available is forced to fall back on the workers of normal, that is, average efficiency—there will still remain those whose efficiency is genuinely below normal because of age, weakness of mind or body, disorganization of working habits, lack of any work experience, or lack of ability to acquire new skills in place of those processes preempted by machinery. Many of these could be usefully employed in simple tasks and sheltered occupations, such as civil works and civil works service have shown the way to provide, but we cannot foresee any probability that industry as at present organized will normally utilize their services, or that we shall cease to count our unemployed by millions of people able and anxious to do some kind of work, during the time which our Committee has set itself to consider, or indeed at any time within the reasonably near future.

We recall also that during the "prosperous '20's" there was increasing unemployment, well known to social workers but scarcely credited by the rest of the country, so that the resulting need was met, in so far as it was met at all, as a purely local responsibility. There is danger that with a slight lifting of the depression the public will suddenly come to believe that distress is at an end or can safely be left again to local resources. We believe it is important that the public and its legislative representatives should realize the long pull that stretches ahead. In looking forward to a "resumption of normal industry," the conditions of 1928 should not be our goal. At the period of most frienzied industrial activity and highest profits preceding the crash of 1929, there were probably at least two million persons in the United States unable to find employment. All the machines were busy but not all the men. We cannot consider as satisfactory a state of industry, however profitable in terms of money, which masks such an extent of unemployment. America needs and must have more security for the workers in and out of employment than those times provided.

Nothing has so unified the opinion of our profession as the successful fight to secure the assumption by the federal government of the residual responsibility for the relief of its needy citizens. We have watched with a peculiar gratification the setting up of a competent administration in the federal government to carry out this great undertaking and we bear free witness that remarkable progress has been made in a period of a few months toward liberalizing and improving the standards of relief administration in many localities and perhaps generally throughout the nation.

But this progress has been made by an emergency organization, acting through emergency organizations in the states and localities. There is not yet discernible the hoped-for development of strong state and local boards of public welfare, closely tied in with the emergency effort, and developed so as to become the permanent custodians of the relief tasks which the emergency organizations must eventually relinquish. Political interference with the administration of relief has not been eliminated in spite of most valiant efforts to dislodge its sinister tentacles. Major changes in policy have followed each other with such rapidity that confusion, lack

of efficiency, and loss of security for the unemployed have inevitably resulted.

There has not yet been a determined effort to seize the unprecedented opportunity which exists to convert emergency efforts into a permanent public program for the welfare of all the people. The fruits of federal participation cannot be reaped unless social workers, public officials and citizens of goodwill begin without delay setting up, as a permanent part of state and local government, the machinery which will permit the assumption of the load the federal government must eventually lay down. This task needs to be set about at once. It cannot wait until the emergency ends but the suggestions as to how it may be accomplished lie more especially in the fields of other sub-committees of the Committee on Federal Action in Social Welfare.

B. FERA Program to Date

By this term we mean to indicate the whole complex of tasks undertaken on a federal, state and local basis under the Acts of 1932 and 1933.

Direct Relief

While no social worker is likely to claim that the provision of relief throughout the nation has been adequate, any one with an opportunity to see the picture in the large must testify that there have been many marked advances in the direction of adequacy, particularly in the states where federal or state funds have had to meet the greater part of the relief bill. Under the FERA, there has been consistent pressure from Washington for increased food allowances and for adequate clothing; medical and nursing care has been allowed; cash relief has at least not been discouraged; and there has been some—but only a very sporadic—clarification of the rent issue. The nonpayment of rents in cases where families are otherwise on full budgetary relief has been and remains the darkest area in the relief picture.

Surplus Relief

In considering the operations of the Surplus Relief Corporation as a subsidiary of the FERA, we face the same dilemma that faced the government when it decided to form that corporation. The choice between destruction of our national surplus in the course of stabilization operations and the distribution of it to the needy as supplemental relief in kind could only be made logically on the latter basis as long as these seemed to be the only courses that were open. However, in view of the social and administrative disadvantages which large-scale commodity distribution involves (growth of commissaries and food queues, risks of spoilage, upsetting of administrative routine already over-burdened with detail), we urge a reconsideration of the Surplus Relief plan with a view to removing these objections. It would seem to us that the government might better seek to dispose of our national surpluses by international barter, selling the foreign products so secured and applying the cash to a program of cash allowances for our unemployed.

Care of the Homeless

The problem of transiency, as disclosed during the period from 1930 to the present time, is peculiarly a continuing responsibility of the federal government because of its national aspects and inter-state complications. While the problem has been made acute by the so-called emergency, it is one which has been with us for years and it will require long-time planning on the part of the federal government for its solution.

In July, 1933, the FERA under powers vested in it, undertook to meet the problems of the "transient" and on the basis of experience to plan for the future.

The principles formulated in the plan recognized the problem as a national responsibility; defined the transient, for administrative purposes, as one who had been less than twelve months within the boundaries of a given state; recognized the transient family and seamen and certain migratory workers as within the scope of the program; assumed 100% responsibility for the relief of these persons, except for hospital care, through a network of state transient bureaus, operating within a state through a limited number of Central Registration Bureaus and Service Centers established at strategic points on travel routes.

There was set up a Federal Transient Bureau under a director. The Federal Administrator had authority to approve state plans and the appointment of the State Transient Director. A highly intelligent program is now in process of development. Trained personnel was recommended throughout the service and good case work is available to those in need. The system of records provides the necessary social data on the basis of which future planning can be undertaken.

No authentic data were available as to the size of the transient problem, estimates ranging from 250,000 to 1,250,000 persons.

Experiments are under way, in many states, which attempt to meet the varying needs of the transients on a demonstration basis.

Social workers, who had so much to do with bringing the needs of the transient group to the

attention of the drafters of relief legislation, must hail this federal experiment as marking a momentous change in attitude and practice in the field of public relief. It is a recognition of the broad national implications in the difficulties created by the economic breakdown and the consequent modification in our public social work set-up.

There is no doubt that this problem of the "unsettled" needy person will be with us for many years. We therefore believe that the present program should be continued, modified as time and experience indicate, until proper standards of service and adjustment of the individual are worked out and necessary legislative changes put through.

There are certain problems, however, which need immediate consideration.

(1) *Hospitalization.* While other forms of medical care may be made available to the transient out of federal funds, no provision is made for hospitalization when needed. Under the federal program, local communities chosen as concentration centers for transients have no voice in the selection and it is natural that, hard-pressed as most of them are to provide free medical care for their resident unemployed, they should resist pressure to furnish it also for the "outlander" whom the government has quartered in their midst. It is not, of course, feasible to set up and equip federal hospitals to care for these people. The only equitable course would appear to be for the federal government to assist communities to provide this care on a fee basis, which would cover at least a portion of the cost.

(2) *Congregate Care.* The present system of caring for transients involves quartering them for the most part in congregate institutions providing free shelter and meals. It is unnecessary here to labor the point that institutional life is a doubtful benefit at best to normal human beings and that it is to be justified only for such groups as require custodial care because of physical or mental defects or in order to restrain anti-social behavior. Some among the transient group—the aged, the mildly insane, the chronic petty offender—may need institutional care and the development of a new type of industrial-agricultural colonies for the residuum of the transients is strongly indicated. But this would be a wholly different place from the temporary shelters and camps which now house them and along with them the vast majority of individuals of average capability who could safely be allowed to make their own plans if they could find work. Failing that, they could be and should be cared for in the community on a relief basis in suitable quarters of their own choosing. There is no reason for the vast difference in treatment in this respect between residents and itinerant workers.

(3) *Compensation Insurance.* Although transients in shelters and camps are expected to engage in work of a public nature in return for free shelter and food, they do not qualify for workmen's compensation because they are not on a wage basis. In other respects including the hazards to which they are subjected, their position is no different from men in CCC or CWA jobs. Special consideration should be given to this problem to assure the same degree of protection to the transients as to men taken from local relief rolls.

(4) *Wages.* The difficulties described in (2) and (3) above are largely attributable to the fact that transients receive no wages for the work they do. We believe that relief work should be provided for them, at a wage sufficient to meet their budgetary needs, either through the Transient Bureaus or by some arrangement with CCC and CWA for their placement. This would at once bring them under workmen's compensation and would do away with the necessity of large congregate shelters since with the wages they were allowed to earn they could provide their own food and shelter.

(5) *The Local Homeless.* The standards of care for the local homeless (residents of the community in which they are) are generally so much lower than the standards of care proposed for transients that these latter standards are inevitably dragged down. In some cases, it is known that resident homeless have "taken to the road" in order to secure as non-residents in another community a type of care which their own home town does not afford them. We believe the FERA may well exert increasing pressure through state relief organizations for the purpose of improving local standards of care for the homeless. This applies to men, women and families.

(6) *The Child in the Transient Family.* Children in these families are missing schooling and stable community contacts and are acquiring unwholesome wandering habits. The number of such transient families reported, particularly in the West, is larger than had been anticipated. In December, 12,741 families, composed of 45,198 individuals were reported. A determined effort to stabilize this group is urgently needed.

To assist in the solution of these many problems, we urge that a larger field staff be made available in this field; that greater pressure be brought upon local communities through state agencies for the improved care of the homeless

individual; that states be encouraged to enter into inter-state agreements relating to "settlement" provisions so that unnecessary shifting of transients may be avoided; and that a long-term plan involving federal and state participation be worked out to provide adequate care, stabilization and self-support for the person who finds it necessary to move from one state to another.

Work Relief and Civil Works

Although social workers pushed vigorously the movement to secure adequate funds for direct relief to the unemployed, it was with no conviction that this was the best way to care for their needs. It was simply the only way open at the moment to prevent a gigantic spectacle of unrelieved human suffering. Work relief was seen to be a step in advance through its value in conserving morale and working habits but practical experience with this device has not always been attended with success. It was originally conceived of as the substitution for direct relief of work for wages, its characteristic feature being the choice of workers on the basis of their known need. The daily wage rate was to be not conspicuously lower than that paid commercially for the same work but the earnings were to be adjusted approximately to the budgetary needs by restricting the number of working days per week or month. The work was to be useful and was not to take the place of work for real wages which funds were available to perform. In a few instances and for short periods it has been found possible to keep these conditions in operation but the difficulties have been many and various.

(1) The adjustment of wages to budgetary needs has necessitated complicated overlapping schedules.

(2) It has been difficult to assure that no genuine workers were displaced through work relief.

(3) The pressure to "spread" the work to all available relief workers has reduced total earnings to pitifully small amounts and often made it necessary to supplement work relief by direct relief grants.

(4) It has been difficult to provide skilled supervision and the work has often taken on a make-believe character in the eyes of the workers themselves with resultant laxness and deterioration of work habits.

(5) In the vast majority of programs outdoor manual labor has been all that was provided so that women and men of delicate physique and white-collar workers could be given no suitable work-opportunities.

(6) It was found to cost more than direct relief.

(7) A tendency developed to regard the work done as payment for relief received instead of the relief as a wage for work done and this led to a substitution of relief in kind for cash wages —the so-called work-for-relief system in which a man "worked out" his last week's basket of groceries in order to qualify for next week's.

It was with these perversions in mind of a good idea gone wrong that the Director of the Pennsylvania State Emergency Relief Board reported to the Governor in December, 1933: "Work relief which in a great number of instances has been nothing more nor less than forced labor, bitterly and justly resented by the free American citizens upon whom it has been imposed, should be abolished. Work relief in its usual form is neither real work nor real relief."

When, therefore, the plan of civil works was announced as a new means of coping with the problem of unemployment, it was welcomed by social workers with a feeling of relief and enthusiasm. It made the fact of unemployment, rather than the added factor of being in need, the basis for obtaining public employment. It did away with the necessity for investigation except as to skill and fitness to do the work and this was made a matter for the employment service and not the social worker to decide. That it would eventually make necessary the employment of fewer social workers did not affect their generous reception of the new plan—a fact which should be brought to the attention of those who claim that this profession is interested only in making more jobs for its members.

The justice of removing from the relief machinery entirely and placing on a genuine wage basis people whose only social lack is a job which they are competent to do, had been generally conceded by those directly concerned with relief and by the public at large. It was thus accepted, not so much because of the immediate benefits entailed, as because it seemed to point the way to a new national responsibility for the unemployed, based on entirely new principles. If it had been understood from the beginning that only another short-term "drive" at dearth and distress was contemplated by its sponsors, it is doubtful that this enthusiasm would have been forthcoming. We have suffered the recoil from too many emergency programs already to have rejoiced at the prospect of another.

Civil works began on November 15, 1933. By January 1, 1934, it was employing upwards of

four million persons. (See memorandum on Current Relief Statistics.)

Its best friends concede that it was too hastily launched and that the relief machinery of the country had too little warning and time for preparation. There were no doubt compelling factors arising out of the hazards in the whole recovery program which made this necessary. The difficulties in the civil works program to date—and they have been many—have been largely attributable to three factors of which lack of time for preparation has been the most important. The other major handicaps have been restrictions in the matter of wage rates and choice of projects laid upon it through its dependence upon the Public Works Act and the awakening of eager interest in it on the part of politicians and spoilsmen when they learned that it involved large cash disbursements for wages and materials.

But although civil works loaded a second enormously complicated task on the shoulders of relief administrations, they were undertaken with a will in the full realization that some lost motion and adjustments would be inevitable and in the expectation that the experimental period could soon be worked through. It was with corresponding dismay that social workers in general learned of the proposed discontinuance of a program which had brought comparatively satisfactory results in so short a period. Instead of leading, as they had hoped, in the direction of a permanent social *reform*, it became apparent that civil works was not regarded by the Federal Administration as even an integral part of *recovery* but only a preliminary step towards it.

The decision to curtail in summary fashion a program which has been pushed forward under "forced draft," involves disappointment piled upon disappointment to the millions still unemployed and will in our judgment throw an unmanageable task of reorganization back upon the relief administrations. The effect is as if an engine running at top speed were thrown into reverse. It will stop but gears will be stripped in the process and heavy costs will be entailed which cannot now be foreseen.

As far as possible to judge in so short a period, we believe that greater provision should have been made in the civil works program for persons who had not yet reached the relief rolls. The original determination to draw half the workers from the source should have been adhered to. Inability to adjust wages with local conditions in mind has been a handicap, as also the rigid restrictions as to nature of project under the PWA Act. We would point out one serious avenue for fraudulent claims on the United States Treasury in the future, due to men having been put to work and covered by federal compensation without any medical examination. If soldiers had been inducted into service during the Great War without this precaution, it is easy to imagine what a free hand would have been given the compensation-claims attorneys after their return.

Administrative Problems

In general, the security of the unemployed has been furthered under the present Act because state administrations could definitely reckon for several months in advance what grants they might expect from the federal government, as long as the states cooperated to the best of their ability. Where controversies have arisen between the FERA and state governments over finances, we believe they have generally been resolved with wisdom and moderation on the part of the federal administration. The wording of the Act permits the Administrator to withhold grants, a step which seriously threatens the innocent clients, or to take over a state administration body and bones, and this has been done, in some instances by amicable arrangement, in a few by forcible methods. Short of that, the federal administration is given no specific right to approve or disapprove state relief plans.

Adequacy of Service

Adequacy of service has been added as a concomitant to an adequate relief plan and the pressure exerted from Washington for skilled and experienced personnel in supervisory positions has brought about a greatly improved quality of public service. The FERA has done much by indirection to break down the irrational insistence by states that professional personnel on state and local relief staffs must be legal residents of the locality but a good deal of this ancient superstition remains to be got rid of.

No formal channels of intercommunication between state administrations have yet been developed and such conferences as have taken place between individual state directors have been incidental or accidental. All lines of communication lead from the state capitol to Washington and straight back again.

C. The Immediate Future

Before another major bill is introduced, a realistic examination of the employment prospects should convince the Administration that there will be little diminution in relief needs and de-

mands during the next fiscal year. The publicity given to civil works and the belief of the unemployed (entirely justified by the development of the program) that the surest way of getting a job was to apply for relief, has resulted in bringing a flood of fresh applications to relief offices generally. Great numbers of these people, though they had never received relief, have been found entitled to it. They will remain to swell the rolls, unless a wholly unexpected upturn takes place, or they can get a job on public works.

II. CURRENT RELIEF STATISTICS

February 7, 1934.

(This bulletin was prepared by Helen Crosby, Secretary of the Conference Planning Committee. It represents summaries of detailed statistics from a number of sources which were available. Miss Crosby was assisted by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, and by Ewan Clague.)

1. *Extent of Unemployment*

It is recognized that only estimated data are available in this field.

American Federation of Labor's Mid-Monthly Estimates of Unemployment During 1933. ("New York Times"—February 3, 1934.)

January	13,100,000	July	11,793,000
February	13,294,000	August	10,960,000
March	13,689,000	September	10,108,000
April	13,256,000	October	10,122,000
May	13,896,000	November	10,702,000
June	12,204,000	December	6,800,000 (a)

(a) The A. F. L. estimate quotes 10,826,000 as the number unemployed in December, but includes in this estimate 4,000,000 temporarily employed on CWA and CWS projects.

2. *Number on Relief and in Relief Employment*

A. *Public Unemployment Relief Cases (not including transients), Continental United States, 1933. (FERA Monthly Report—1933.)*

Month	Number of families receiving relief	Number of single resident persons receiving relief	Number of persons receiving relief
January	3,850,000 (a)		
February	4,140,000 (a)		
March	4,560,000 (a)		
April	4,475,322		
May	4,252,443		
June	3,789,026		
July	3,448,621	480,000 (a)	15,500,000 (a)
August (a)	3,350,000	430,000	15,150,000
September (a)	2,995,000	415,000	13,370,000
October (a)	3,010,000	435,000	13,615,000
November	3,357,878	460,000	15,060,000
December	2,650,000 (b)		

(a) Partially estimated.

(b) Rough estimate:

Preliminary reports covering 64 per cent. of the total urban population of the United States indicate that the number of relief cases (families and single resident persons) decreased 21 per cent. between November and December.

This decrease might be compared with the Children's Bureau figures on public relief cases in urban communities from 1929 to 1932. In those years the increase from November to December ranged from 22 per cent. in 1932 to 32 per cent. in 1929.

B. *Number of Transients Receiving Care*

By December 31, 1933, 261 transient centers in 40 states and the District of Columbia and 63 work camps had been established, taking care of

168,340 unattached persons
45,198 persons from 12,741 families

Total 213,538 persons

C. *Number in Civilian Conservation Corps Camps*

Month	No. Men Employed	Payroll
November	340,713	$14,086,448
December	317,735	12,300,000 (approx.)

D. *Number Employed on Civil Works Program*

CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS

Week ending	Number of persons working	Wages earned	Average weekly earnings
November 30, 1933	1,435,186	$14,784,933	$10.30
December 28, 1933	3,280,334	44,068,030	13.43
January 4, 1934	3,483,459	49,974,662	14.35
January 11, 1934	3,733,592	56,141,209	15.04
January 18, 1934	3,847,322	58,836,284	15.29
January 25, 1934	3,807,490	44,807,843	11.77

CIVIL WORKS SERVICE PROJECTS

Week ending	Number of persons working	Wages earned	Average weekly earnings
November 30, 1933	36,301	$ 331,948	$ 9.14
December 26, 1933	139,207	1,650,651	11.86
January 4, 1934	149,680	1,962,551	13.11
January 11, 1934	175,541	2,379,677	13.56
January 18, 1934	196,278	2,698,844	13.75
January 25, 1934	198,774	2,402,529	12.09

Total wages earned on both projects from week ending November 23, 1933, to January 25, 1934—$392,814,641.

E. *Composition of October, 1933, Relief Load as Revealed by the Special Unemployment Relief Census Conducted by the FERA*

3,134,678 relief families, comprising 12,493,776 persons were covered by the study. Forty-two per cent. of all persons receiving relief were found to be children under 16 years of age. Older persons—those 55 years of age and over—were less plentiful in the relief group than in the general population figures. Negro families made up 18.4 per cent. of the load, about double their representation in the general population. Non-family persons made up 13 per cent. of the relief case count, while that group constituted only 7.9 per cent. of the whole population in the 1930 U. S. Census. The largest number of persons receiving relief fell in families having four members, although three-person families predominated in the "size of family" grouping.

3. *Sources of Relief Funds*

Sources of Public Unemployment Relief Funds—Continental U. S. 1933

Period	Local Amount	Local Per cent.	State Amount	State Per cent.	Federal Amount	Federal Per cent.	Total
1st Quarter	$68,622,077	32.8	$18,405,682	8.8	$122,380,457	58.4	$209,408,216
2nd Quarter	52,983,695	25.2	20,593,182	9.8	136,579,468	65.0	210,156,345
3rd Quarter	40,517,000	22.4	26,951,000	14.9	113,412,000	62.7	180,880,000
October	14,516,000	22.4	9,914,000	15.3	40,370,000	62.3	64,800,000
November	13,308,722	18.9	17,228,225	24.5	39,831,838	56.6	70,368,785
December (a)							
4th Quarter							
Total	$189,947,494	25.8	$93,092,089	12.6	$452,573,763	61.5	$735,613,346

(a) Figure not available. There was a decrease of 23 per cent. in total obligations for unemployment relief between November and December from all public funds in areas representing 64 per cent. of the total urban population of the United States.
In comparison with this decrease the Children's Bureau figures for 1929 to 1932 show increases in expenditures of December over November ranging from 26 per cent. in 1932 to 48 per cent. in 1930.

4. *Types and Adequacy of Relief*

A. *Types of Relief*

The distribution of public relief expenditures for the month of November, 1933, by types of relief is given below. These figures cover 67.3 per cent. of the total public relief operations (exclusive of administrative costs) for that month.

	Amount	Percentage
Food	$25,110,629	70.0
Shelter	2,759,308	7.7
Clothing	3,085,918	8.6
Medical care	852,882	2.4
Fuel and light	3,849,951	10.8
Household necessities	192,063	0.5

B. *Adequacy of Relief—Average Monthly Relief Benefits Per Family* (From testimony of Harry Hopkins to Congress—January 30, 1934)

Period	States as a Whole	Principal Cities in State	Remainder of States
May, 1933	$15.52	$21.19	$11.64
July, 1933	15.07	19.86	10.83
September, 1933	17.22	21.97	12.69
November, 1933	18.22	23.27	14.12

It should be remembered that wide variations exist in the amount of relief given in different sections of the country. Detailed figures for November show that one quarter of all the families on public relief received less than $10 per month and 42½ per cent. received a benefit of between $10 and $20 per month.

5. *Federal Relief Grants*

Federal Emergency Relief Administration Grants—May 22 through December 31, 1933 (data from FERA Monthly report December 31, 1933)

Purpose of Grant	Amount	Per cent
General Relief		
Under sub-section B (matching)	$199,808,344	61.6
Under sub-section C (discretionary)	95,015,944	29.3
Sub-Total	$294,824,288	90.9
Special Grants		
Transient Relief	$ 3,775,555	1.2
Self-help organizations	273,344	0.1
Educational programs	1,721,801	0.5
"Surplus" commodities	23,833,500	7.3
Grand Total	$324,428,488	100.0

III. REVISION OF STATE POOR LAWS

(Edith Abbott prepared this bulletin for discussion by a sub-committee of the Association's Committee on Federal Action of which she is chairman.)

The question of fundamental changes in the so-called "Poor" or "Pauper" Laws of the various states, whether these statutes should be repealed and new laws enacted, or the old laws should be drastically amended so that they will represent modern social work theory and practice, is one of the very important questions before the members of the American Association. These laws are, most of them, survivals of the old statutes adopted more than a century ago in one state after another, many of them following old Colonial laws which in the beginning had followed the general principles of the English Poor Law. These statutes have been amended from time to time but the general principles of administration, of providing relief funds, and of care for those in need of public aid have remained substantially unchanged.

The more recent statutes, which provide special forms of relief, particularly those statutes providing mothers' aid and old age pensions, have usually been set up outside of the poor law and have created new kinds of public aid much more in line with the modern social work theory on this subject. Blind pensions should perhaps also be mentioned here but this particular form of relief has been much more largely a response to political demands.

The old poor laws, therefore, represent the social thinking of past generations and general home relief, particularly in rural and semi-rural areas, has been very little influenced by the development of social case work and other modern professional standards. These old statutes, consequently are very much in need of thorough revision and this Committee and the Washington Conference should consider the following general changes in the various state laws regarding provision for those in need:

Changes in Form

First, there are certain changes that may be described as changes in form rather than in principles of relief giving or administration.

(1) *Change of Name.* Probably every one will agree that the different names of these statutes, such as "Poor Law" or "Pauper Law," should be changed to some new title such as "Public Assistance Law," or "Social Welfare Law" which will be less associated in the minds of both clients and social workers with the old degrading methods of poor law practice. The name *pauper* should be entirely eliminated both from the title and from the body of the statutes,

and as far as possible modern social work terminology should be used throughout. In connection with this point, attention may well be called to the very excellent example set by the new poor law of New York which is called the Social Welfare Law (1927) and in which the influence of social workers is very marked.

(2) *Codification.* The different forms of public assistance are now administered in many instances, not by social workers but in the case of the old poor law, by the old local authorities and in the case of the newer forms of public assistance, by lawyers who have become county judges or juvenile court judges, and who have very little understanding of the modern science of social welfare and the modern methods of social work. Social workers should now consider the possibility of bringing all of these forms of relief together into one social welfare statute. This would mean that the various forms of public aid would be administered in a single administrative organization such as a county bureau of public welfare which would be staffed by trained social workers. Such a statute would include the following services:

(a) General Home Assistance (provision for the group still dependent on the present "Poor Relief" or "Pauper Laws")
(b) Mothers Aid or Mothers Pensions
(c) Blind Pensions
(d) Old Age Pensions

These different forms of aid are now administered under different statutory provisions and under such different public officials as supervisors and overseers of the poor, juvenile court judges, county judges, justices of the peace, and various other officials who are elected like other political candidates without the special qualifications that are necessary for dealing with those groups in the community for whom the taxpayers are asked to provide public assistance funds.

The Old Principles

Second, with regard to the provisions of public assistance, the poor laws of the American states are now, almost without exception, based on the following principles which are no longer accepted as scientific principles of social welfare administration. The question before us is whether these old principles should be repealed. These poor law principles are, in general, as follows:

(1) *Local Responsibility,* that is, the old requirement that public assistance must be provided by the local governmental authorities, such as townships and counties. The failure of this principle during the depression years has been merely additional evidence of its failure in normal times. This principle has been handed down from an age when the local unit was vastly more important than it will ever be again. It is a principle that antedates the development of modern methods of communication and modern methods of transportation which enlarged the horizon of life for the ordinary man.

The old principle of local responsibility has resulted in very inadequate standards of public aid and very antiquated methods of giving service to those in need. It has led to corruption and graft among petty officials at the expense of the destitute. It has meant the use of deterrent methods in the giving of relief, the humiliation and degradation of our unfortunate clients.

Social workers will probably agree that minimum standards of social service and of public assistance can only be secured by very radical changes regarding the responsibility of the various governmental authorities to the men in need. This man is a citizen of the United States, of the state, of the county, of the township. He has responsibilities to all of these governments; they all have some responsibility for promoting and maintaining his welfare. The question, therefore, is whether the federal government, the state government, and the local government should not all share in the maintenance of adequate welfare services. If these governments share the expense, they must also share in the maintenance of high standards of administration which means not merely adequate public assistance funds but social service as well as money for those in need.

The inadequacy and inefficiency of local relief services has been everywhere exposed. State and federal authorities were obliged during the last few years to come to the aid of the local authorities. What is to happen next? Are social workers prepared to let the old local governmental units go back to the old system; or are we ready to demand that the state and the federal governments continue to assume some share of the public aid services? And, if so, how shall the share of responsibility of each be apportioned? If we are prepared to insist that federal and state help must be continued, and if we believe that only in this way can the old incompetent system of local relief administration be brought to an end, a division of responsibility regarding the provision of funds something like the following may be considered:

(a) For general home relief:
Federal government to provide one-fourth
State " " " " "
Local " " " one-half
and also administrative costs

(b) Mothers' Aid:
Federal government to provide one-third
State " " " " "
Local " " " one-third
and also administrative costs

(c) Old Age Pensions:
Federal government to provide two-thirds
State " " " one-third
Local " " " only administrative costs

(d) Blind Pensions:
No recommendation here.

Some comment on the division of responsibility regarding funds is necessary. In the field of "general home relief," federal and state governments are now carrying a very large part of the cost. It would seem to be desirable that both the federal and state authorities should continue to contribute some share in order that such relief may be adequately provided. Due to the influence of tradition, it may well be more difficult to persuade state and federal governments to share in the expense of general home relief than in the newer forms of public aid.

In the field of mothers' aid, federal authorities have been giving nothing and state governments have gradually been making appropriations for equalization purposes. All over the country these mothers' aid systems are greatly in need of additional funds. In many places there are long waiting lists and in other areas the pension grants are despicably small. Federal authorities should establish the kind of mothers' aid systems that will provide adequate family budgets and the necessary social service for these women and children. This can only be done with substantial help from the state and federal governments.

With regard to old age pensions, a newer form of public assistance, the states have been more liberal in the matter of making grants-in-aid to the local authorities. However, many of the old age pension laws are still very improperly carried out and inadequate funds are voted for this purpose. Old age pensions would be a proper subject for federal action and if the federal government is providing the bulk of the funds, as is suggested, leaving the state authorities to provide a further substantial grant, we should really have an old age pension system that will remove large numbers of families from the relief rolls.

In the case of all of these forms of public assistance, home relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, the local governments should be given the assistance of grants-in-aid only on condition that the local county bureau of public welfare provide proper social service personnel for the distribution of these funds and for continuing care of the families given assistance.

In connection with attempts to provide for the sharing of the costs of public services between different governmental authorities, the modern principle of *equalization* should not be overlooked. The relative ability of states or minor governmental authorities in the matter of raising funds must be considered in the distribution of federal funds and any rule that provides for apparently routine division of responsibility should be made contingent upon the ability of the states or minor local authorities to raise the necessary funds. As social workers, are we not prepared to say that men, women and children living in the most destitute areas shall not be dependent upon those areas for help and that special grants-in-aid will be available for areas of special poverty or special distress.

(2) Another principle, the possible abolition of which should be considered is that of *Legal Residence or Settlement.* This principle, which followed the legal theory of local responsibility for support made each local unit responsible only for those who met statutory residence requirements which the local community accepted as constituting eligibility for tax-supported aid. So long as the federal and state governments accept the major responsibility for the cost of relief, the old questions of settlement become unimportant, and the question which social workers should now face is whether an effort should not be made to abolish the principle entirely.

In the past, this principle has led to expensive litigation in all states and in many cases the time of lawyers, states attorneys, corporation counsel, attorneys general, and the time of judges of local and supreme courts have been expended upon the question of whether some poor man, woman or child should be assisted by Township A or by Township B. Modern social welfare principles demand that public aid be given promptly to the human being who is in need, regardless of whether or not he has lived in a given unit of local government for any statutory period of time. Minimum standards of relief and service should be available in all localities with the sharing of local responsibility with state and federal governments. The question therefore is whether settlement provisions can not be entirely repealed and whether the principle of the new social welfare or public assistance law should not be that every person in need should be given assistance wherever and whenever that need exists.

(3) Another poor law principle that should be considered is that of *Legal Family Responsi-*

bility, prosecution of the members of the family of the client within certain specified degrees of relationship when these members are unwilling, but are believed to be able, to contribute to the client's support. The moral obligation of helping the members of one's own family is almost universally recognized and the importance of maintaining and strengthening family ties is accepted as a fundamental principle of human relations by all social workers. But such relationships and such moral obligations can not be maintained or strengthened by legislation. The present laws prescribe expensive litigation which is often very painful to our clients, which does not yield any returns in family solidarity, and which yields monetary returns which are far below the expense of litigation. The social work group, therefore, may well recommend that all legal provision for such prosecutions be dropped from the new social welfare statutes dealing with public assistance.

ADMINISTRATION

Third, with regard to administration, the old method of leaving any of the public assistance services entirely to local political authorities or local administrative authorities should be carefully re-considered. The federal, state and local social welfare authorities should all have some responsibility for public assistance. This subject has already been referred to in connection with the discussion of local responsibility. But going on to specific questions of administration are not social workers now ready to recommend that a permanent federal authority should be provided which would have charge of the allocation of federal funds and which would set certain standards of adequacy of aid and of social service. The state and local authorities would have somewhat different names in different states. In general, however, these authorities might be as follows:

(1) The Federal Public Assistance Bureau (or whatever may be the statutory residuary legatee of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration).

(2) The State Public Welfare Department acting through a Division or Bureau of Public Assistance.

(3) A County Bureau of Public Welfare.

In most states, therefore, when the proposed new public assistance statute is substituted for the old poor law, it will be necessary to recommend the following statutory authorities for the administration of the new statute:

(a) A Division of Public Assistance in the State Department of Public Welfare. This Division will have charge of the allocation of the state grants to the county public welfare units and will at the same time be given power to make these grants conditional upon the provision of proper social service personnel and proper local funds being provided for the local county departments of public welfare. This Division should be in charge of a well-qualified social worker of experience and no federal grants should be made when this department is in charge of a political appointee who changes with the political change in the state administration.

(b) The establishment of county departments of public welfare to take over the functions of the supervisors or overseers of the poor who have been administering poor relief under the old "pauper" system. These departments will have other functions such as the care of dependent children and the administration of child placing funds and funds of children's institutions.

The necessary statutory changes will be more easily made in some states than in others. But it will be necessary to look forward to securing many statutory changes in all of the states in order to make a sweeping substitution of social work machinery in place of the very antiquated system under which the people have suffered such great hardships. To make these administrative changes which demand appropriations from the funds raised by taxation through the different local and state authorities will require vigorous and widespread support on the part of the social work group. Shall we proceed to draft a model statute along the lines suggested leaving to different state legislative reference bureaus the modifications needed to bring the model public assistance statute in harmony with the other laws of the particular states?

IV. FUTURE COORDINATION OF FEDERAL DEPENDENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

(This memorandum was prepared by Harry Lurie as Chairman of a sub-committee of the Association's Committee on Federal Action.)

Introduction

Social workers have been entrusted with the responsibility for administering measures for the relief of poverty and distress through governmental and voluntary action. To engage in these tasks on a professional level the social worker

must consider the fundamental social and economic factors involved in the problems with which he is dealing. Present programs should not be in conflict with basic principles of economic and social efficiency and should lead to proposals for future planning that represent a progressive advance in social organization.

The Background of Current Federal Action

Previous to the depression, the relief of distress and care of dependents were considered primarily as a local responsibility with local government in many instances relying upon voluntary effort for dealing with these important problems. As a result we did not possess in this country an adequate system of public welfare and relief. Instead we were relying upon an uncoordinated aggregate of poor relief services, both governmental and voluntary, which represented a socially inadequate mechanism for dealing with problems of individual and family need. This system was not only inadequately organized but was based upon the outworn concept of the individual's responsibility for his own poverty, the theory of "less eligibility" and of insufficient aid. It largely ignored the fact that conditions of poverty were primarily related to the problems of economic security for labor. It is this haphazard system of local poor relief which under the pressure of the economic crisis assumed some degree of responsibility for the millions of destitute unemployed and their families as well as for an increasing number of dependents presenting other problems.

The Emergency Character of Federal Responsibility

The present program of governmental relief has been developed under the stress of the emergency and has been grafted upon the inadequately organized local and state agencies for public aid. At first the federal relief program was established on the basis of loans and advances to states without direct federal responsibility for relief programs. Within the last year this has been replaced by measures which involve some degree of direct federal responsibility for the unemployed. It should be noted, however, that these measures are in the nature of emergency programs and do not indicate that the federal government has accepted or intends to accept the relief of unemployment as its direct obligation apart from the period of the emergency.

Relief Measures and Recovery Measures

Federal legislation has developed along three general lines:

(1) The major relief efforts which have attempted to supply funds for unemployment relief and have determined methods and standards of relief through state and local organizations based upon established traditions.

(2) Emergency employment measures which have brought into being, through the expenditure of governmental funds, productive projects offering employment opportunities in public service or in governmentally financed projects. These include the Public Works Program under the Public Works Administration, the plans for subsistence homesteads, the development of the Tennessee Valley project, the program of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the work projects of the Civil Works Administration and the Civil Works Service.

(3) The economic and industrial legislation of the government operating through the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which represents an attempt on the part of the federal government to restore industry and agriculture to a more effective functioning. It is believed by the national administration that these measures may solve the problem of surplus labor and increase the competence of private industry to serve the general welfare.

Basic Principles in Future Planning

Basic to future national planning for the problem of dependency it is essential that a number of fundamental principles be clearly defined and accepted:

(1) The recognition that the dislocations and mal-functioning of the economic functions which produce unemployment and distress are not of an accidental character but are inherent in the nature of our economic organization and represent essentially the problem of economic insecurity of labor under our present system.

(2) That the economic basis for security can only be obtained on a national scope and that local economic conditions are dependent upon and interrelated with a nation-wide economy. That the solution of the problems of unemployment and dependency therefore requires a nationally integrated program.

(3) The emergency relief and employment measures developed by the federal government indicate an acceptance of governmental responsibility for economic welfare and individual and family security as measures of expediency necessary in the present crisis. A continuing program must be premised upon the acceptance by the federal government of a primary and continuing responsibility for the solution of the problem of

unemployment and for providing economic security for the various types of dependency.

(4) That the problems of unemployment cannot be separated from related problems of economic insecurity; that a national program for unemployment relief needs to be closely related to problems of unemployability, to illness and disabilities of wage earners, to the problems of the aged who may be superannuated for productive industry, and of youth, for whom a normal vocational adjustment has not been established.

(5) The national character of economic problems and the discrepancies which exist between local resources and local needs make it necessary to establish national resources for welfare programs.

(6) Although there are large variations due to particular regional and local economic circumstances and traditions, the ultimate goal is the establishment of minimum standards of security applying to the entire population. The national program for dependency, therefore, requires a close cooperation between the federal, state and local governments in the administration of the national welfare program.

If we accept these general principles as forming the basis for a future program of public welfare, we may consider some of the particular measures which will be required to put these principles into effect. The following are suggested:

A. Organization of a National Welfare Program

A comprehensive program for public welfare should be created within the federal government. This program needs to be planned and closely related to a federal program for industry and labor, and the organization of health services and educational programs.

The program of national public welfare will require:

(a) A national budget integrating local, state and federal resources for public welfare through a unified plan of national taxation.

(b) The development of standards and policies for governmental employment of the unemployed and for various compensation measures necessary for the economic security of the unemployed and other types of labor problems.

(c) The coordination of the various governmental services, national, state and local, into a single national program for administrative purposes.

(d) The administration of a national program of public welfare coordinated with local and state units operating under a national civil service assuring adequate standards of personnel and personnel practices.

B. Special Measures Suggested

1. *General Labor Policies*

For labor to share equitably in production on the basis of economic capacity of the nation, the control of industry cannot be left exclusively to owners and financiers. On the assumption that the system of private industry will continue to operate for some time, it is essential that minimum labor standards be established which shall have as their objective the safeguarding of earnings and the protection of labor. If the system of private capital is to be continued, it is clear that in the future it must justify itself on the ground of social welfare assuring to labor adequate standards of living. Such assurances require governmental action including control and regulation of all private industry.

2. *The Right to Employment*

On the presumption that adequate standards of living and maximum employment are attainable through the organization of private industry, the federal program for dependency may be considered as a supplementary form of governmental action to assure a minimum standard of security to the entire population. In the light of the present breakdown of economic organization, there is justification for grave doubts concerning the effectiveness of the present capitalist system for the economic well-being of the population. To the degree that political and economic measures which are being developed by the present administration fail to stimulate a high degree of productive effort, provisions must be made for supplementing private industry with governmental programs of employment and relief.

It is essential that provisions be made through the use of national resources for the full employment of labor not absorbed by private industry. The future national program must contain as its primary activity a program accepting responsibility for providing employment at adequate standards of compensation for all employable unemployed. The use of public credit which in essence means governmental access to the resources of the nation now in the hands of private owners needs to be employed in productive and useful undertakings in a courageously planned comprehensive program of public employment. The national government must accept the principle of the right to employment and develop measures for discharging that obligation.

Relief for the employable unemployed must be considered as measures necessary because of an

inadequate economic program. All programs of relief must be based upon the principle of the right to employment and be considered as a form of compensation for unemployment rather than as measures of charitable relief.

3. *Compensation Rather Than Relief*

The principle of compensation for unemployment and insecurity rather than relief should also be applied to the problem of the dependent aged for whom industrial opportunities are not available. Insofar as aged persons are not required for optimum production in a socially ordered economic system, it is desirable that such compensation for the aged be made available.

4. *Compensation for the Sick and Disabled*

Temporary disabilities, such as those due to ill health, require similar provisions for compensation. Compensation for ill health and disability needs to be related to a socialized organization of health services and medical care.

5. *Compensation for Accidents*

There should be a national coordination of measures for compensation to labor for accidents and occupational diseases. This system should be related to measures for industrial rehabilitation and to the development of special employment projects for the handicapped capable of productive effort.

6. *Education and Youth*

A national program for the preparation of youth for productive undertakings, involving subsidies for education and maintenance of children above the minimum child labor age, needs to be developed.

V. CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROPOSALS AND REPORTS

I. National and State Proposals

A. National

1. *Wagner-Lewis Bill* (H.R. 7659). This bill proposes a 5 per cent tax on the pay rolls of all industries doing an interstate business. This tax would be refunded to industries in those states establishing unemployment insurance schemes providing a satisfactory minimum ($7 a week has been suggested) for the unemployed. The individual states would be left free to devise their own schemes.

   Advocates of this plan list the following advantages:

   That it would put pressure on all states to adopt unemployment insurance legislation soon and make the system nation-wide.

   That it would allow states to select the particular plans which suit them best and at the same time provide a national minimum standard.

   That it would remove any competitive advantage which industries in a state without an insurance plan would have over those with unemployment insurance.

2. *Lundeen Bill* (H.R. 7598)*. This bill, known as the "Workers Unemployment and Social Insurance Act," would provide non-contributory federal compensation both for unemployment and for loss of wages due to part time work, sickness, accident, old age or maternity. The provisions of the bill include:

   1. Benefits of not less than $10 a week plus $3 for each dependent, for all time lost through unemployment or disability.
   2. Benefits to be extended to all workers (industrial, agricultural, domestic or professional) without discrimination because of age, sex, race or color, religious or political opinions.
   3. Funds to be secured by taxing inheritance and gifts and all individual and corporation incomes of $5,000 a year or over. No tax or contribution to be levied on workers for purposes of Act.
   4. Administration of compensation through commissions composed of rank and file of members of workers' and farmers' organizations.

B. State

During 1933, bills to provide for compulsory unemployment benefits were introduced in the legislatures of 25 states and a bill applying to the District of Columbia was introduced into Congress by Senator Wagner. None of these bills was passed and this left the situation as it was in 1932 with only one state—Wisconsin—with an unemployment insurance law.

* Information about this bill was not included in the memorandum on Unemployment Insurance sent out before the Conference.

In 1932 Wisconsin enacted its law to become operative July 1, 1933. This date has been postponed until such time as the Industrial Commission finds that business recovery has progressed sufficiently to permit successful operation.

The various state legislative proposals can be classified roughly into three categories depending on whether the group for whom the reserve is accumulating consists of the employees of a single firm, or of an industry, or of all the industries in a state.

1. *Company Reserves.* A separate account is kept for each firm whose payments thus go into a reserve for its own employees. When a firm has so stabilized employment that reserves are accumulated beyond a certain amount per capita, contributions are suspended. Presumably this creates a strong financial incentive for the individual employer to regularize his operations.
2. *Industry Reserves.* All firms in a given industry are required, in some plans permitted, to pool their contributions. The premium rate depends upon the industry's experience with unemployment. An incentive is created for joint stablization measures.
3. *State-wide Reserves.* All employers in the state are to contribute to a single fund; provision can still be made for graduating the employers' premiums according to a merit rating system or according to the unemployment rate shown by different industries. The object is to obtain an insurable risk by distributing the risk as widely as possible.

In addition to these variations as to reserve groups, there are varying provisions as to contributors. Some assess the full cost on the employer; others provide for contributions from the employees as well, either voluntary or compulsory. None provide for state contributions but in some plans the state is assigned an administrative and custodial role.

All of the plans include the payment of unemployment benefits to employees with the exception of agricultural workers, domestic servants and salaried employees receiving a fixed amount. All employers in a state employing more than a pre-determined number of persons, are compelled to enter the scheme.

It is widely recognized that to be successful, an unemployment insurance system must be closely linked with a system of public employment services or exchanges whose function it is to find suitable jobs for unemployed workers and thus prevent unnecessary drains upon the reserves as well as unnecessary waste of human resources. The employment exchange formulates and administers policies determining when a worker is unemployed and eligible for unemployment benefit. These services are now provided for in the Federal Employment Service Act of 1933, creating the United States Employment Service.

C. *Summary of Wisconsin Bill*

The Wisconsin Bill falls into the first category with reserves accumulating by individual firms. Its provisions can be summarized as follows:

It covers all employers employing 10 or more persons, with the exception of certain enumerated classes of employees. It provides for a reserve fund for each company, and for contributions by the employer alone, amounting to 2 per cent of the pay roll, for the first two years. After the reserve has reached $55 per employee the rate is reduced, and when the reserve reaches $75 per employee it ceases. After a two-week waiting period the unemployed worker is entitled to not more than $10 a week or 50 per cent of his wage for not more than 10 weeks per year. The Act is to be administered by the State Industrial Commission. The Commission, and any county or municipality with the approval of the Commission, may establish local free employment offices to assist in carrying out the purposes of the Act.

D. *Summary of Recent New York Legislation*

The Steingut-Mastick Bill for job insurance was introduced into the New York State Legislature January 29, 1934. The provisions of this bill are of particular interest because they have been gradually developed through four years of conferences and efforts have been made to reach a compromise satisfactory to the advocates of the various plans.

The proposed law provides that workers who have been employed for thirteen or more weeks during the previous twelve months shall be entitled to benefits in the ratio of one week of benefits for each three weeks of such employment. After a waiting period of three weeks, if suitable employment cannot be found with another employer or is not offered by the public employment office at which he has given notice of his unemployment, the worker may draw benefits of 50 per cent of

his average full-time wages, but not more than $15 a week for sixteen weeks in any one year.

Employers are required to pay into a state fund unemployment reserves by regular contributions not exceeding 3 per cent of pay roll. These reserves will be kept in separate accounts, so that each employer will be directly responsible for benefits to his own unemployed workers. As an incentive to furnish regular employment, it is provided that when the employer succeeds in building up and maintaining a reserve of $100 per employee, his contributions may be discontinued. Employees, although not required to contribute, may do so voluntarily, in order to increase their benefits. The state makes no contribution to the funds.

Provision is made for voluntary pooling by groups of employers in certain unstable industries. Such pooling is required when the administrative authority, after investigation and public hearing, finds that it is desirable in order to carry out the purposes of the act.

As an added protection to the workers, it is provided that one-tenth of all employer contributions shall be set aside in a general fund to be used in paying supplemental benefits if prolonged unemployment should deplete the individual account of an especially hard-pressed employer.

This new feature, while providing a wider distribution of the risk and additional security to the workers, does not invalidate the primary principle of the reserve plan, which puts the immediate load of responsibility directly upon the individual employer or industry and gives to efficient management opportunity to reduce its insurance costs by supplying steady employment to its own workers.

The system will be administered by the State Department of Labor, but responsible employers who have set up approved plans, or labor unions which have established acceptable funds jointly with employers, may upon official authorization continue to operate them under strict state supervision.

II. Reports of Various Commissions on Unployment Insurance

During 1931 and 1932 commissions were appointed in several states by the United States Senate and by the governors of a group of eastern states to consider the question of establishing by legislation systems of compulsory unemployment reserves.

Reports have been made by the interstate group in Ohio, California, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Minnesota and New York. In general, these reports are favorable to the idea of state-wide plans mandatory upon all employers in the state. In Pennsylvania there was disagreement in the commission and four separate statements were presented. In New York further study was urged.

The report of the Ohio Commission, published in 1932, is here summarized. It represents the point of view of a group in favor of the state-wide insurance system as contrasted with the company reserve system proposed in the Wisconsin law. Recommended features of such a system are as follows:

A. The system should be compulsory for all industries.

B. All funds should be pooled and the premiums should be graduated according to the unemployment rate in the respective industries after the plan has been in operation for three years.

C. Employers and employees should both contribute, the original rate of the contribution to be 2 per cent of pay roll and 1 per cent of earnings, respectively.

D. The benefit should amount to 50 per cent of normal weekly earnings of the insured, beginning after a waiting period of three weeks and payable for 16 weeks, the maximum benefit per week not to exceed $15.

(*Note:* The American Association for Labor Legislation, which has been a pioneer in advocating unemployment insurance legislation, is sponsoring especially the unemployment reserve type of legislation (Category No. 1) but not to the exclusion of the others. It is assisting the interested groups in the various states with the type of law which has local support.)

VI. CURRENT HOUSING INFORMATION

(This digest was prepared by Abraham Goldfeld for the Housing Sub-committee of the A. A. S. W. Committee on Federal Action.)

For several generations social workers have been agitating for the improvement of housing conditions of the low income group. Today because of the new impetus for better housing pro-

vided by the "New Deal," it is essential for social workers to refocus their attention on this serious and complicated problem.

The main reason for the new offensive in the housing program is the fact that for the first time in the peace-time history of this country the United States Government is ready, either by direct action or indirectly, to enter the field of housing by supplying the necessary funds and supervising the planning of new building.

Housing Division of PWA

Under the National Industrial Recovery Act passed by Congress on June 13, 1933, the Federal Government is authorized:

(1) To make loans to limited dividend companies from the $3,300,000,000 emergency fund for the "construction, reconstruction, alteration, or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum clearance projects."

(2) To provide for outright grants of funds up to 30% of the cost of labor and materials of housing projects undertaken by public bodies, states, counties, or municipalities.

To carry out the provisions and purposes of this act, the Public Works Administration set up a Housing Division with Robert D. Kohn as its Director.

The Housing Division since its inception has approved fully or tentatively a number of projects, of which the following are outstanding:

Neptune Gardens	Boston	$3,500,000
Spense Estate	Brooklyn, N. Y.	2,025,000
American Federation of Full Fashioned Hosiery Workers	Philadelphia	845,000
Boulevard Garden Housing Corp.	New York	3,210,000
Neighborhood Association	St. Louis	500,000
Hillside Housing Corp.	New York	5,184,000
Hallets' Cove Garden Homes	Astoria, L. I.	2,975,000
Suburban Housing Association	Hutchison, Kan.	40,000
Indianapolis Housing Corp.	Indianapolis	4,460,000
Hillcrest Homes Corp.	Philadelphia	1,290,000
Boylan Housing Project	Raleigh, N. C.	168,000
Harms Park Housing Corp.	Chicago, Ill.	1,330,000

It is of interest to note that 13 states in the Union have laws for public regulation of limited dividend housing corporations. These states are Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina and Texas.

Cities where municipal housing authorities have been organized are Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, Milwaukee, Detroit and Los Angeles.

Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation

Not satisfied with the number of plans and requests for loans from private limited dividend corporations, the federal government on November 18, 1933 created the "Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation" under PWA to itself "construct, reconstruct, alter, and repair low-cost housing projects or slum-clearance projects, apartments, houses, homes, and structures of every kind." In a statement released December 10, Secretary Ickes explained that:

"It continues to be the policy of the Public Work Administration to encourage local study and promotion of low-cost housing. The Public Works Administration will continue to loan on slum clearance operations and low-cost housing projects sponsored by limited-dividend corporations. Such corporations have a distinct advantage in certain fields of activity. It is the intention of the Public Works Administration to take the initiative in slum clearance and low-cost housing projects in the interest of unemployment relief and recovery, only in cases where local agencies are unable to do so or unwilling to act promptly. Such projects will be undertaken by the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation upon invitation from local officials and/or groups of representative and responsible citizens or civic organizations. Where the Housing Corporation initiates, local groups and agencies will be utilized to the fullest extent possible in the acquisition of sites, design, construction, and operation of the projects."

On December 26 the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation announced its entrance into the housing field in Cleveland, Ohio, to construct two and three-story structures appropriating funds up to $12,000,000.

However in January, 1934, Comptroller General J. R. McCarl declared, the Corporation in violation of the Constitution and the entire matter at the present time is in progress of adjustment.

Housing and CWA

Another government activity in the field of housing recently announced is the Civil Works Administration's offer to demolish "bad housing" owned either by public bodies or by private individuals who agree to turn over the standing buildings to CWA.

Miss Mary E Murphy
848 No Dearborn St
Chicago Ill

DELEGATES TO THE CONFERENCE

Attendance at the Conference surpassed all preliminary estimates and expectations. A total of 44 chapters were represented by 122 delegates. There were also seven representatives from non-chapter territory, and three from a prospective chapter. Credentials were given to members of several of the Association's national committees including the Conference Planning Committee, the Executive Committee, the Federal Action Committee and its sub-committees, the Committee on Personnel Standards, and also to a small number of special representatives, bringing the total attendance up to 194.

Following is the list of chapter delegates and representatives from non-chapter territory:

AKRON—Heloise Hendershot, Helen Knight
ALABAMA (prospective chapter)—Mrs. Florence Adams, Winifred Collins, Roberta Morgan
ATLANTA—Ernestine McGill, Thomas B. Mimms
BALTIMORE—Harry Greenstein, Anna D. Ward, Helen M. Weir, Ruth O. Blakeslee (alternate)
BERKS COUNTY, PA.—Mary Ann Isbister, Helen Shackelford
BOSTON—Roy Cushman, Robert C. Dexter, John Ihlder, William H. Pear, Esther Rugg
BUFFALO—Paul Benjamin, Roy F. Woodbury
CHICAGO—Samuel Goldsmith, Joel D. Hunter, Jacob Kepecs, Clara Paul Paige, Wilfred Reynolds, Amelia Sears, Lea Taylor, James T. Nicholson (alternate)
CINCINNATI—Bertha Allen, James E. Stewart
CLEVELAND—C. W. Areson, Leyton Carter, Violet Kittner, A. G. Knebel, Elizabeth Magee, Wilber I. Newstetter, Stockton Raymond, Virginia Wing
COLUMBUS—Howard R. Knight
DAYTON—Arch Mandel
DELAWARE—Mrs. Bertha N. Borton, Alida C. Winkelmann
DETROIT—Eleanor Ford, Sarah Selminsky, Harold Silver, Rosemary Stackpoole, Susan Copland (alternate)
ERIE, PA.—Jessie Blauvelt
FAIRFIELD COUNTY, CONN.—Violet Babcock, Dorothy Stockham
FORT ORANGE, N. Y.—Mrs. Mary B. Holsinger
HARRISBURG—Paul Goldblatt, Richard Stilwell
HARTFORD, CONN.—Kenneth L. Messenger, Leroy Ramsdell
INDIANAPOLIS—Estle Fisk, Eugene C. Foster, Helen Pearson
ILLINOIS STATE—Effie Doan, Helen H. Hazard
KANSAS CITY, MO.—C. W. Pfeiffer
LOUISVILLE—Mary B. Stotsenburg
MADISON—Helen I. Clarke
MILWAUKEE—Edith Foster, Evelyn P. Johnson
NEW HAVEN—Etta M. Hamilton
NEW JERSEY—Mary Bogue, Odessa Gibson, Leonora Rubinow, T. Lester Swander
NEW ORLEANS—Bertha Scheuermann, Florence Sytz, Beatrice Hodge (alternate), Eva Smill (alternate)
NEW YORK CITY—Douglas Falconer, Gladys Fisher, Jacob Fisher, Abraham Goldfeld, Fred Hall, Adele Hamerschlag, Gordon Hamilton, Anna Kempshall, Helen Mayers, Mrs. Henrietta Mayfield, Rev. Edward R. Moore, George Rabinoff, Homer Wickenden.
NORTH TEXAS—Dr. A. H. Flickwir
NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA—Joseph E. Beck, Harry Carey
OHIO STATE COMMITTEE—Leila Kinney
PHILADELPHIA—Abigail Brownell, Theodora Butcher, Rachel Childrey, Mrs. Sarah Marnell, Lena Waters
PITTSBURGH—Marion Hathway, Mrs. Edith G. Tufts
RHODE ISLAND—Clarence A. Pretzer, Leonore Young
RICHMOND—Miriam Dettelbach, Frank Preston, Georgiana Sinclair
ROCHESTER, N. Y.—Dr. Carl R. Rogers, John P. Sanderson, Winona F. Young
SEATTLE-TACOMA—Arlien Johnson, Orville Robertson
SOUTH CAROLINA—Charlotte Stevenson (unofficial)
ST. LOUIS—Edith Baker, W. W. Burke, Walter Burr
SYRACUSE, N. Y.—Lisle Burroughs, Paula Frank
TOLEDO—L. Genevieve Griffin, Wendell Johnson, Minnie Byrne (alternate), Mrs. Josephine Dennhardt (alternate)
TWIN CITY—Pierce Atwater, Elsa Castendyck, Mrs. Catheryne C. Gilman
WASHINGTON, D. C.—Leroy A. Halbert, John Melpolder, Helen F. Story
WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS—Edgar W. Austin
NON-CHAPTER REPRESENTATIVES—William Beehler, Lucy J. Collins, Lilly Nairne, Pearl Salsberry, Adelaide Salter, Mrs. Bessie Bloom Wessel, Mrs. Bessie Lamb Woolfolk

No February Compass

The February issue of *The Compass* has been omitted this year, so that the March issue is Number 6 of Volume XV.